

Findings from the
"Information Literacy
In Washington
Community and
Technical Colleges"
LSTA Grant
2003-2008

Report prepared by the Data Analysis Group

Aryana Bates - Highline Community College
Shireen Deboo - South Seattle Community College
Lynn Deeken - Pierce College (Grant Coordinator)
Nicole Longpré - Bellevue Community College
Laura Staley - Renton Technical College

August 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Executive Summary	3
Grant Activities	5
Grant Outcomes	8
Outcome 1 – Authentic Assessment	8
Outcome 2 – Increased Librarian Knowledge and Ability	14
Outcome 3 – Discipline Faculty	20
Outcome 4 – Developing and implementing strategic IL programs.....	25
Outcome 5 – Developing Data Collection Instruments	27
Grant Deliverables	28
Project Implementation	31
Conclusion	34
Appendices	
A. Original Grant Report	35
B. Pre-Immersion Case Study Example	48
C. Action Plan Example	53
D. Implementing Authentic Assessment Rate by Colleges	56
E. 2006 Project Report Example	57
F. 2007 Project Report Example	66
G. 2008 Last Assessment Project Report Example	70
H. Best Practices 2006 Example	83
I. Best Practices 2008 Example	90
J. Program Track Participants Self-Assessment	97
K. Teacher Track Participants Self-Assessment	108
L. Discipline Faculty Survey Results	117
M. Implementing Action Plan Rate by Colleges	131
N. Excellent Library Contributions	132
O. Measuring Contributions	142
P. IL Grant Wiki	144

Introduction

In 2003 a consortium of Washington State Community and Technical College libraries applied for a grant of Library Services & Technology Act (LSTA) funds to further the teaching of Information literacy on their campuses. This grant began with the leadership of the Library Media Director's Council (LMDC). The grant proposal (see Appendix A) was written by LMDC's Information Competency Committee comprised of Debra Gilchrist (Pierce), Myra Van Vactor (Bellevue) and Wai-Fong Lee (Seattle Central).

The goal of the project was to give librarians and other faculty the skills, resources, and time to integrate IL throughout the curriculum.

From the original grant proposal:

Interdisciplinary teams of librarians and faculty from WA two-year colleges (CTC) will collaboratively develop and implement programs that utilize Information Literacy (IL) as both a lifelong skill and an instructional strategy. Participation in the ACRL Immersion program will strengthen IL pedagogies and librarian's teaching. Assessments demonstrating the relationship between IL and student success will be implemented.

CTC librarians believe that effective pedagogy for lifelong learning requires resource-based learning. The LSTA grant will provide resources that will enable librarians to acquire the skills necessary to transform teaching by integrating Information Literacy throughout the curriculum. New methods of assessment are critical to ensure our place within the higher education agenda.

Executive Summary

Information Literacy is a high priority for the Community and Technical College libraries. This project set out to ambitiously invest in our libraries, librarians, the discipline faculty we collaborate with and most importantly – students and their learning. Below are the major outcomes for this grant and a brief discussion of the findings.

Outcome 1 – Assessing Student Learning

During three years of assessment work, there were 43 projects focused on assessing student learning conducted by 21 schools. At a minimum these projects involved 5668 students, 157 discipline faculty and over 100 librarians. All libraries reported implementing some level of assessment into their instruction efforts. One third of the libraries reported having established authentic assessment partnerships with at least three departments on

campus.

Outcome 2 – Librarian Information Literacy Professional Development

Using ACRL's "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices" libraries self-evaluated their Information Literacy program in the areas of mission, goals and objectives, planning, institutional support, articulation with curriculum, collaboration, pedagogy, staffing, outreach, and assessment/evaluation. Overall, nearly 90% reported increased implementation of at least 20% in their information literacy program.

Three years after attending ACRL's Immersion Program, participants in both the Program and Teacher Tracks reported growth in their teaching and assessment abilities. In the Program Track, 83% increased at least one point (five point scale) in the areas of information literacy programs, partnerships, leadership, and culture of assessment. Twenty-five percent reported a 2-point gain. The most significant growth areas were in building partnerships and developing assessment programs. In the Teacher Track, 94% increased at least one point (five point scale) in areas of teaching methodology, learner-centered approach, learning styles, assessment and leadership skills. Fifty-six percent reported a growth of two or more points. Teacher Track participants enthusiastically reported that the Immersion program advanced their teaching abilities.

Outcome 3 – Discipline Faculty Information Literacy Professional Development

Collaborations with discipline faculty were a key component of assessing student learning. These collaborations increased faculty awareness of information literacy, instruction more integrated with student needs and the ability of librarians and faculty to assess their students' gains in information literacy and the skills needed to complete their coursework. Faculty that had worked with librarians on grant projects were surveyed about their familiarity with and incorporation of information literacy into their pedagogical strategies and assessment (130 respondents from 18 colleges). Faculty reported that they incorporate resource-based learning (96%) as a pedagogical strategy. Faculty also strongly indicated (90%) that student papers and/or projects demonstrated improvement with library instruction. Comments from the responding faculty also clearly indicate the value they find in working with librarians to improve assignments, create instruction relevant to students

needs, and to their own understanding of information literacy.

Outcome 4 – Information Literacy Programs and Plans

Every library with a Program Track participant in the ACRL Immersion program drafted an Information Literacy Action Plan which was then taken back to the library for adoption and implementation. Six libraries (27%) reported that they implemented 25% of their initial Action Plan. Sixteen libraries (45%) had implemented 50% or more. Six libraries (27%) had implemented 75% or more of their Action Plan.

Outcome 5 – Library’s Contributions to Student Achievement

Addressing the need for libraries to be able to demonstrate their impact on student success and retention, this outcome’s work is still in progress. Library Directors and librarians have worked to align library activities, programs, services and values with a variety of campus outcomes (i.e. college’s missions, goals, strategic directions, values and student learning outcomes). Next, they identified priorities and measurable data elements that could have the most impact.

Grant Activities

Year One - 2003/2004 - "Envisioning"

The first year was one of organization and creative envisioning. We began by meeting as a group of 98 librarians from 32 Libraries in the WA Community College system at Lake Washington Technical College in April of 2004. Carol Hansen was our featured speaker on “Imagining the Future: Creating a Shared Vision for Information Literacy in Washington”. We looked at a variety of approaches to Information Literacy, the ACRL Standards and challenged to create the Information Literacy programs we wanted at our schools.

Pierce College was established as the fiscal agent for grant funds and Lynn (Olson) Deeken became the grant coordinator. Her responsibilities included regular reporting to LMDC on grant activities and objectives, communicating with college librarians, managing the budget and distributing funds, maintaining the Grant Wiki of group work, planning and/or facilitating workshops, and reporting to the State Library on progress and budgetary needs.

Year Two - 2004/2005 - "Learning"

The big event for this year was the ACRL’s Immersion Program June 5-10, 2005. It was the

first time a group like this applied to be one of the Regional Immersion programs. Eighty-three librarians from 28 Community Colleges and 1 university and two iSchool (library school) students came together at Sleeping Lady in Wenatchee, WA for one full week of work focused on information literacy. There were 56 librarians in the Program Track and 29 librarians in the Teacher Track. Almost every college attending had at least one participant in the "Program Track".

In preparation for Immersion, all of the colleges prepared a Case Study (an Immersion requirement) describing their current institutional background, environment and priorities, organizational placement of library's instructional efforts, instructional program content, programmatic elements they wanted to address, strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities (see Appendix B). Workshops were held at three locations around the state to prepare participants for Immersion and for writing their case studies. Grant funds were used to pay for the cost of Immersion and to subsidize some of the cost for lodging and travel to ensure the highest level of participation by colleges.

By the end of the week, each Program Track college had a draft "Action Plan" to share with the rest of their library and begin implementing (see Appendix C). Teacher Track participants had a Teaching Portfolio.

Year Three - 2005/2006 - "Design and Implementation"

This year was devoted to librarians returning to their libraries and colleges to begin implementing their information literacy programs and designing assessment projects focused on student learning. A workshop was held at Highline Community College – "Creating, Collaborating and Implementing Authentic Assessments in Teaching" - in the Winter of 2006 to focus on defining and creating authentic assessment projects. Immersion participants and additional librarians that were not at Immersion attended.

After the workshop, colleges wrote project proposals for the projects they wanted to fund with faculty stipends, librarians release time, etc. Each school was given an initial budget of \$1000 to plan with. The projects that libraries created during this year touched 1,239 students, 67 discipline faculty and 32 library faculty.

That spring, libraries also completed a self-inventory based on ACRL's "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practice". Colleges indicated which

characteristics were present before the grant started and now midway through grant activities (2.5 years).

Year Four - 2006/2007 - "Continuing Assessment"

This year was dedicated to continuing their assessment efforts through funding information literacy and assessment projects. The State Library agreed to fund this project for an additional year so that libraries could continue to practice and hone their assessment practices before we began collecting the data to assess our overall progress and achievements.

Libraries continued to create and implement projects specific to their programs. Projects in this year touched 2,587 students, 68 discipline faculty and 34 librarians.

In August, 31 library directors and librarians, with facilitators Lisa Hinchliffe and Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer, met to begin work on our fifth outcome related to developing data collection and reporting instruments that could help libraries demonstrate a library's impact on student success and retention. Our big activity was to examine how a college's mission, goals, strategic directions, values and student learning outcomes already connected to the work of libraries. The next step is to create and refine our methods and tools of assessing this work to make these connections even clearer.

Year Five - 2007/2008 - "Data Collection and Dissemination"

This fall 43 librarians from 19 colleges met for the last time as a large gathering to work on The Last Assessment Project. This last set of projects involved 1842 students, 22 discipline faculty and 22 librarians. During Winter quarter, libraries also worked to complete various end-of-grant assessment projects

The Data Analysis Group (DAG) also formed at this time, comprised of the Grant Coordinator and four librarians from various colleges. The group met regularly this year to gather and analyze the data related to the grant outcomes and write this final report.

Grant Outcomes

Following are the original grant outcomes with the intended assessments and criteria. The methodology, results and analysis is outlined for each. There is an additional “salient points” section that incorporates quotes from librarians and/faculty related to that outcome.

Outcome I

“Authentically assess student’s information literacy within courses in order to determine student ability in the context of a course or program, as well as determine specific contributions of the library overall student success. ”

Part A

Assessment: *Spreadsheet for each college indicating distribution of assessment by academic department.*

Criteria: *75% of colleges will incorporate authentic assessments. 25% of colleges will incorporate authentic assessment in at least 3 academic and professional/technical departments.*

Methodology and Results

The Data Analysis Group developed a multiple choice question (see Appendix D) and asked each college to measure what level of success it has achieved in incorporating authentic assessment. Options included incorporation into every instruction session, within at least three programs or departments on campus, occasional incorporation by some librarians for some sessions, or no incorporation efforts at all.

Twenty-two colleges (85% of the original Program Track libraries) responded to this survey question. The positive outcome is that every responding institution has incorporated at least some level of assessment into their instruction efforts, with half the respondents indicating some effort by some librarians in some instruction sessions. Four colleges (18%) report complete incorporation of authentic assessment in their instruction efforts across campus. Seven colleges (32%) have established authentic assessment partnerships with at least three departments on campus. These results exceeded the measure for this outcome.

Salient Points

Testimony from participants:

- *“Based on Immersion learning about assessment, I have developed rubrics and integrated assessment in library sessions and in my work with discipline faculty.”*
- *“I design assignments with clear outcomes, curriculum, learning activities, assessment mechanisms and assessment criteria.”*

Example Authentic Assessment Projects from 2005-2007

Between attending the Immersion Program and engaging in their last assessment project, schools spent two years implementing their action plans and engaging in assessment of student learning. See Appendices E-F for example reports. Go to the IL Grant Wiki (<http://informationliteracywactc.pbwiki.com>) to access all of the projects.

Their strategies fell into three different categories. Some schools focused on reaching faculty and the administration. Some concentrated on the students. And some looked at the ways new technology could assist with IL instruction. The chart below shows just a few of the projects initiated during this portion of the grant.

Highlights of 2005-2007 Grant Projects to Further Information Literacy	
Forging Alliances with Faculty and Campus Administration	
School	Project
Seattle Community College System	Created "Literacy Immersion 2006", a three day conference for their district's college faculty, to teach them to incorporate the tenants of information literacy into assignments.
Cascadia	Held a "mini-retreat". Faculty, from a variety of disciplines, and eight librarians discussed IL topics and implementation.
Clark College	Succeeded in having IL competencies adopted as a college-wide outcome.
Highline Community College	Mini workshops for 6 faculty with librarians on identifying/integrating/assessing IL in Writing 101. Librarians embedded into several quarter long courses to teach research strategies and assess IL. Quarter long librarian collaboration with four faculty to strategize integrating IL into the curricula of core courses in Writing, Reading, Speech, and College 100.
Pierce College and Yakima Valley Community College	Created and published model rubrics to help their instructors accurately assess student learning.
Focusing on the Classroom	
School	Project
Bellevue Community College	Worked with faculty members to create new assignments which combined subject instruction with IL concepts, and assessed both discipline and IL learning.
Clark College	Created a Website Assessment form for any Internet resource they used that had not originally been a print item. This taught students to evaluate web sources.
Whatcom Community College	Created an "Information Literacy Survey", which determined whether the students understood what IL was

	and why it was important, and how they wanted IL content taught.
Highline Community College	Asked students (in groups or as an individual assignment) to identify what they had learned in IL instruction. This helped to design future IL instruction. Quarter long collaborative project between two faculty and a librarian that had students create information resource wikis as part of their final project.
Using Technology to Inform and Evaluate	
School	Project
Spokane Community College	Created a webpage "Faculty Toolkit for Teaching Information Literacy" (http://www.scc.spokane.edu/?libinfoittk) which combined the best IL resources from the web, with materials they created.
Highline Community College	Created online "Faculty Toolkit" with IL resources and examples: http://flightline.highline.edu/il/index.html
Renton Technical College	Implemented Turning Point , a student response system, which encourages full participation of the class, and allows the librarian to gauge understanding of each concept as it is taught.
Clark College, Highline Community College	Developed web modules to teach IL topics.

Part B

Assessment: *Pretests of student knowledge of information literacy concepts before library instruction will be given.*

Criteria: *Students performance will improve from pretest to learning assessments by 40%. Discipline faculty will indicate student papers and projects demonstrate improvement by at least 2 points on a 5 point rubric as compared to classes where library instruction was not incorporated.*

It eventually became clear that the majority of libraries were not ready to implement pre- and post-testing to meet this grant outcome. Instead, it was decided that the grant participants would engage in a final assessment project using forms of authentic assessment that were specific to their settings. In November of 2006, the participants were brought together for a one day workshop on authentic assessment. Twelve schools created a final assessment project, focused on student learning. All were asked to report on the same aspects of their projects so that we would have consistent assessment data to look at (see Appendix G).

- **Outcomes** – What did you want the student to be able to do?
What did students need to be able to do in order to be successful?
- **Curriculum** – What did the student need to know?

- What's the ground/content that needed to be covered?
- **Pedagogy** – What were the learning activities?
What was the setting and activities for the students to gain/develop these abilities?
- **Assessment** – How did the students demonstrate the learning?
What assessment did you design for students?
- **Criteria** – How did you (instructor and librarian) know the student had done this well? How did you judge/evaluate the performance?
- **Data** – What data did you collect? How did the students perform?
- **Best Practices** – What would you recommend out of this project as a Best Practice you would pass on to other librarians or discipline faculty?
- **Key Learning** – What's your observation or reflection on this project? What did you or the faculty member learn from this project?

Methodology and Results

Two trends emerge from the project reports submitted in May, 2008: the development of rubrics to evaluate information literacy, and the exploration of self-assessment as a learning tool. Three schools tried various self-assessments. Six schools worked with rubrics. Finally, while it does not constitute a trend, one school conducted an interesting experiment with pre- and post-testing.

Rubrics.

Many of the schools who participated in this grant round developed or fine-tuned rubrics to measure their instructional success. Some were refining instruments they had developed in previous quarters.

Several themes occurred repeatedly through the reports:

- Rubrics are useful assessment tools. They are useful because they explicitly state what should be learned, and give clear measures for success. This structured approach helps students (and instructors) focus on what is important.
- Faculty are key to the process of developing and using rubrics to assess student learning. Many librarians found that providing models of assignments and rubrics, or even sitting down with faculty to design an assignment with IL features, improved acceptance of IL competencies.
- Rubrics may need to be altered to improve instruction. Several reports noted that they were revising their rubrics as a result of this experience.
- Rubrics help us identify when we are trying to teach too much. Several institutions noted that they were consciously choosing to limit their IL objectives per teaching session.

Self-Assessments.

Cascadia tried several different measurements, but identified student self-assessments as their strongest tool. These were done using an "Information Literacy Self-Assessment Worksheet". Students completed these forms three times, first two weeks before library instruction occurred, second in the sixth week of the quarter, and finally after the last paper

was turned in.

These worksheets listed six dimensions of information literacy such as “Defines the topic and/or research question”, and asked the students to reflect “Where am I? What do I need to work on?” They found the responses to these question fulfilled several needs.

From the Best Practices section of Cascadia’s May 2008 report:

- “Self-assessments offer students time and space to reflect on their learning and progress around a) an entire course, b) specific learning goals, c) specific tasks, processes or assignments.
- Self-assessments can be tools for student to track learning and identify areas needing improvement....”
- Reviewing periodic student self-assessments offers librarians and instructors data for use in identifying trends, understanding student progress, and formulating and/or redirecting the path of instruction within a course.
- This format for assessment is sustainable and easy!(Cascadia, 2008.)

Cascadia librarians report satisfaction with this form of evaluation. “Though self-reported, comparing students three self-assessments against each other demonstrated students felt they made steady progress through the quarter. This was also exemplified by their rough draft and final papers which the instructor observed surpassed the quality of papers he’s received from his Eng 102 students in previous quarters.” (Cascadia, 2008.) They intend to continue using these forms, with some modifications, in future efforts.

Pierce and Seattle Central Community College also experimented with self-assessments. Pierce College asked students to write for one minute at the end of the Information Literacy instruction, describing previous IL instruction, their estimation of their knowledge before the session, and what they had learned during the session. Seattle Community College librarian Lynn Kanne also pre-tested her students by asking them to assess their knowledge of library sources and research.

Pre-test/Post-test Assessments

When assessing student learning, it is useful, if not always practical, to understand what the students knew before they received instruction. Centralia College conducted a pre-test/post-test evaluation for students in an English 101 class.

Before the library instruction session, the instructor gave the students an exercise asking them to identify characteristics of a reliable web site. This was the pre-test. The following

day students were given Information Literacy instruction on evaluating websites. After the instruction, they were asked to complete a worksheet evaluating pre-selected websites. They were asked to rate the reliability of the site, list the criteria they used to determine reliability, and explain how the site satisfied or failed to satisfy that criteria. This was the post-test.

On the pre-test, only 37.5% of students could list at least two criteria for reliable websites. On the post-test, 88.9% of students could list at least two criteria for reliable websites. This was an increase of over 100%. The pre-test/post-test model clearly demonstrates learning occurred as a result of the Information Literacy instruction.

Pre-test/post-test is valuable because it offers clearer evidence of instructional effectiveness. As more campuses adopt information literacy elements as part of their campus outcomes, more libraries may wish to consider instructional models which clearly indicate success in attaining these outcomes. Campus libraries considering adopting pre/post testing may want to read the Centralia report in its entirety. They made several recommendations regarding the design of the tests, the session, and follow-up with the instructor. For example, Centralia librarian Barret Havens offered this advice: "Pre and post-assessment tools should be similar, if not identical. It is difficult to assess performance when the assessment tools themselves are variables." (Centralia, 2008.)

Salient Points

Rubrics.

- "(W)e both learned that tracking student achievement of important information literacy outcomes (e.g. contextual evaluation) will help us improve teaching and activities aimed at those outcomes."
- "(T)he rubric does a better job of communicating performance expectations."
- Faculty are key to the process of developing and using rubrics to assess student learning.
- "Meeting in person with the instructor and discussing the entire LI and ACRL IL outcome assessment is definitely imperative to this process."
- "The conversation between faculty and librarian can help improve the assignment and the instruction that supports it – the data is only one resource that comes out of this process."
- Rubrics help us identify when we are trying to teach too much.
- "The three areas of learning that I wanted to cover for students ... were still more than could reasonably be "taught" in the lecture/practice session that we had planned."
- "My observation was that I tried to accomplish too much in one session."
- "Prioritize what must be covered, give up some of the efficiency of the lecture and allow more time for discovery."

Self-Assessments.

- "Self-assessments offer students time and space to reflect on their learning and progress around a) an entire course, b) specific learning goals, c) specific tasks, processes or assignments."
- "Self-assessments can be tools for student to track learning and identify areas needing improvement...."
- "Reviewing periodic student self-assessments offers librarians and instructors data for use in identifying trends, understanding student progress, and formulating and/or redirecting the path of instruction within a course."
- "Though self-reported, comparing students three self-assessments against each other demonstrated students felt they made steady progress through the quarter. This was also exemplified by their rough draft and final papers which the instructor observed surpassed the quality of papers he's received from his Eng 102 students in previous quarters."

Conclusion

Several reports commented that this process had given them proof that Information Literacy instruction makes a difference in the quality of student learning. "The good (great, fantastic) news is that bibliographic instruction made a discernable difference in the students' scores. We knew this, but now we have the numbers to back it up." (Skagit Valley College, 2008.)

Many now intend to take this evidence to their schools' academic departments and administration and lobby for more access to classes and instructors. This grant has given the state's Community and Technical colleges the support and resources to create a body of work that can inspire and empower them in the ongoing discussion of the role of libraries and Information Literacy instruction in the academic community.

Outcome II

Increase the level of knowledge and ability of library faculty and directors in 5 key instructional areas (teaching/pedagogy, learning styles, management/leadership, assessment and information literacy) in order to effectively teach in and manage excellent information literacy programs.

Part A

Assessment: Pre and post assessments of information literacy programs using ACRL Best Practices as the rubric.

Criteria: 20% increase in program implementation effectiveness in 50% of the colleges between beginning and end of 4-year grant cycle.

Methodology and Results

Colleges were asked to respond to ACRL's "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices" in the form of a survey at two points in time: 2 years into the grant cycle (see Appendix H) and then at the end of the 4-year grant cycle (see

Appendix I). The first time colleges responded to the survey, at 2 years into the grant cycle, they were asked to rate their standing at the beginning of the grant cycle and then at the 2-year point. The second time, colleges were asked to rate themselves at the end of the grant. The survey asked colleges to rate their program implementation for 77 individual elements. Ratings were based from “no implementation”, to “in discussion”, “in planning”, “new program” to “program strength”. We considered anything from “in planning” to “program strength” to be increased implementation.

19 colleges responded to the survey and noted their progress over the 4 years of the grant. (3 additional schools replied only at the conclusion of the grant.) 17 of 19 colleges (89%) showed an increase in program implementation of at least 20%. The average increase in program implementation was 52%, exceeding this Outcome’s criteria.

Analysis

19 colleges responded to the survey and noted their progress over the 4 years of the grant. (3 additional schools replied only at the conclusion of the grant.) Colleges were asked to respond to 10 areas related to their information literacy program: mission, goals and objectives, planning, institutional support, articulation with curriculum, collaboration, pedagogy, staffing, outreach, and assessment/evaluation. 17 of 19 colleges (89%) showed an increase in program implementation of at least 20%. The average increase in program implementation was 52%. A number of participating colleges already had strong information literacy programs in place at the beginning of the grant, so some schools showed less growth but still had many program strengths.

There were a number of elements that stood out as program strengths for the colleges. While each college had individual strengths and successes, a majority of the colleges noted that their information literacy programs were student centered and were consistent with the mission of their school. Many colleges rated information literacy pedagogy as a strength, and felt that information literacy programs encouraged collaboration with others across the campus. The most noticeable change for colleges seemed to be in terms of assessment. Prior to the grant, few colleges were even discussing assessment of information literacy. Four years later, nearly all schools had a new or ongoing assessment program.

There was great consistency in the elements that the colleges rated on the lowest end of the scale. Nearly every college noted that there was inadequate staffing to promote an information literacy program. More than half of the colleges felt that the information

literacy program was a “library” program and not integrated with shared campus responsibility. Many noted that for those outside the library there was no reward for participating in the information literacy program.

An unexpected finding is that some colleges struggled to maintain program implementation through the 4 years of the grant. A number of schools showed greater progress at the 2 year point than at the conclusion of the grant. This finding illustrates how difficult it can be to maintain programs and keep the momentum building. Colleges also commented that the Best Practices survey was difficult to interpret and in many cases the questions were not relevant to 2-year colleges. One college stated that their answers were quite random since it was difficult to interpret what question the survey was asking. The Best Practices survey was designed to be used by colleges and universities who have a much larger pool of resources and staff than community colleges. A different instrument, one specifically created for community colleges, would have likely provided more meaningful results.

Salient Points

- "The grant has been helpful in providing training and in encouraging us to begin to articulate an information literacy plan/program. It has also afforded us the opportunity to get together with librarians from other community and technical college institutions to learn from and share ideas with."
- "We believe the grant activities leading to our IL Immersion Program for faculty has created momentum outside the library and represent an important breakthrough for us. It has raised IL awareness at the institution level. Still we need to find ways to develop IL leadership outside the library."
- "The grant has been great in terms of getting us moving and making it possible for us to raise awareness on our campus."
- "The grant provided the push to do things that we needed to do but never got around to doing, like a library instruction assessment program. The task of reviewing mission, goals, and objectives has started us thinking about developing a planning framework."
- "[The] grant provided much needed financial support to this work. In addition, our commitment to this greater statewide effort made our work a priority and added weight to our IL outreach efforts with faculty and the institution."
- "The grant was instrumental in initiating and sustaining our recent efforts in IL. The ACRL Immersion created the initial momentum while our local immersion helped us share what we learned with our faculty partners."

Part B

Assessment: Curriculum Design evaluation by Immersion workshop leaders

Criteria: 90% of design plans and work projects will receive at least a 3 on a 5 point

rubric: 75% will receive at least a 4.

This Outcome was not met due to scheduling difficulties. We did not have enough of our Action Plans finalized in the window that an Immersion faculty member was able to give us feedback.

Part C

Assessment: Library faculty self assessments

Criteria: 75% of library faculty participating in the Immersion workshop will indicate at least a one point improvement on a five point rubric on their own ability, confidence, and understanding of the five key areas of the Immersion curriculum; 50% will indicate a two point change.

Program Track Participants

Methodology and Results

Participants answered a short survey (see Appendix J) measuring their growth in Immersion curriculum ability areas. Information was gathered on the participant's skill level before Immersion and then three years after Immersion. There were also narrative questions that allow participants to share their comments about how Immersion has changed the face of Information Literacy at the different colleges.

Overall, results were positive. 83% showed an increase of at least one point on the five point scale. Only 25% showed growth of at least two points. While this falls short of the grant outcome's target, colleges have none the less showed significant change and growth. Participants revealed that the greatest areas of growth were the ability to build partnerships on campus to promote information literacy and the development of a culture of assessment for information literacy.

Analysis

Program track participants were asked to rate their skills in 7 areas, including the ability to build partnerships, the skills to create information literacy programs, leadership, the ability to accomplish an information literacy mission and the development of a culture of assessment. Participants rated their confidence in these areas prior to Immersion. Participants from some colleges began the process with little skills in these areas, while other colleges had already established a foundation in these areas. Regardless of where individuals were before Immersion, all showed growth in these information literacy areas.

83% showed an increase of at least one point on the five point scale, and 25% showed growth of at least two points. The average growth was 1.5 points on a 5 point scale. As individuals from some schools already had a strong foundation in information literacy skills and were already working with an establish information literacy program, it is understandable that some participants did not show a great change in their skills prior after Immersion.

The most significant growth occurred in the areas of building partnerships and in the development of assessment programs. Building partnerships and establishing relationships with colleagues across campus has proven to be crucial: "I think it is critical to build relationships across campus. Find your friends and supporters out there and engage them in your efforts." "The most useful ideas learned at Immersion centered around techniques to enhance collaboration." Prior to Immersion, individuals rated their skills at slightly over 2 on a 5 point scale. Three years after Immersion, that has increased to over 4, nearly at the top of the scale. Immersion articulated the importance of connecting to groups across campus and provided individuals with the skills to build those relationships.

Use of assessment has also shown tremendous growth. Several participants stated that the most useful skill learned at Immersion was "authentic assessment." Growth in this area was from just over 2 all the way to 3.9 on a 5 point scale. Several articulate that assessment is challenging: "Assessment [is most useful]. I don't think I'm skill very good at it, but that was very useful." Assessment programs have been established due to the skills learned at Immersion, and will continue to be a work in progress.

Salient Points

Participants commented on what they learned at Immersion:

- "Applying the structure and discipline of strategic planning to direct, manage & sustain the Library's information literacy initiatives."
- "Immersion helped frame planning and collaboration to help us create and articulate a real information plan that we can share with our colleagues outside the library."

Others commented on how their campus approach to information literacy has changed:

- "Information Literacy is now a college-wide outcome and the librarians now have more leverage in getting involved with other faculty in helping implement and assess the outcome."
- "We have cultivated "information literacy champions" who have helped us build our program. We are planning with the assumption that we will not achieve our goals without faculty from outside the library as our partners. We are also actively engaged in the broader curriculum and assessment work that information literacy is a part of."

Other comments include:

- "Faculty appreciate opportunities to have meaningful discussions about teaching, learning, and curriculum development, and they show up if you offer these opportunities. When framed as part of this conversation, IL takes on great power for faculty."
- "We have begun to engage non-library faculty in assessing information literacy. I think we've made progress in shifting IL assessment to a shared responsibility, but I think we have more work to do to better understand whether & how our teaching & collaborations result in students who are more information literate when they complete their goals at the college."

- "Many faculty partners are more deliberate about info literacy outcomes and provide students with more incremental activities to gain skills, so assessment is also incremental –providing better feedback on individual skill sets that need improvement. Assessment, generally, is more a part of the campus culture than it was."

Teacher Track Participants

Methodology and Results

Participants answered a short survey (see Appendix K) measuring their growth in Immersion curriculum ability areas. Information was gathered on the participant's skill level before Immersion and then three years after Immersion. There were also narrative questions that allow participants to share their insights on their growth after the Immersion experience.

Results of the survey are very positive. 94% showed growth of at least one point on the five point rubric. 56% showed growth of two or more points on the scale. Participants showed the most growth in the use of assessment of student learning and the development of diverse teaching methods.

Analysis

Participants were asked to rate their expertise in 6 areas related to information literacy. The areas included teaching methodology, using a learner-centered approach, understanding different learning styles, assessment and leadership skills. Prior to Immersion, most participants responded that they had little or few skills in these different areas. Most noted that they were, on a scale of 1-5, somewhere around 2. Most notably, the majority of participants felt that they had no experience in assessing student learning prior to Immersion.

All participants showed growth three years after Immersion. 94% showed growth of at least one point on the five point rubric. 56% showed growth of two or more points on the scale. After Immersion individuals felt great skill and confidence (nearly 4 on a 5 point scale) in the information literacy areas. Skills in assessment improved dramatically, with most rating their skill in this area either 4 or 5 on the scale. Participants also showed significant growth in understanding and using diverse teaching methods. After Immersion, most rated themselves as very skilled in this area. Before Immersion, few had great confidence in their teaching methodology.

The narrative questions provided distinct insight into how the Immersion experience had changed the individuals. Comments were overwhelmingly positive. Many individuals commented on single elements that have changed their approach to teaching: "Best tip I learned at Immersion: wait for a response." Others said that how they prepare for classes is completely different: "I design assignments with clear outcomes, curriculum, learning activities, assessment mechanisms and assessment criteria." "I've really adopted the 'less is more' philosophy..." The ability to collaborate with others has been a positive experience for many: "I think the collaboration with others has helped greatly." "Together with my colleagues I have developed a 'Toolkit for Teaching Information Literacy' on our website consisting of exercises, assessments and other instructional resources..." Overall, the Immersion experience has equipped librarians with the skills they need to be better instructors.

Salient Points

Participants responded that they have changed their teaching methods in the following ways:

- "I do a lot more active learning than I did prior to immersion. I used to think that they needed "all the info" before they could apply the learning. Now I try application at a much earlier stage."
- "I've really adopted the "less is more" philosophy, and only try to address those aspects of IL that students will be able to apply immediately given their current assignments. The assessments I've administered, and the feedback I'm getting from students indicates this is really working well."
- In response to how student learning has changed positively, participants said:
- "We often assess student learning now. This seems to assist in the learning process. It certainly encourages student motivation."
- "I have a bigger set of skills when working with students. I recently had an instructor tell me that the class coming for instruction was young and very active. Before I wouldn't have known how to approach a class like this, but I was able to develop an active exercise that still taught the components that were required for the students to be successful with their assignment."

Outcome III

Educating discipline faculty - Educate faculty teaching in the disciplines about information literacy as both skill and pedagogy in order to establish information literacy and resource-based learning as creative, successful and viable instructional strategies and to transform teaching within many of the classrooms.

Assessment: *Survey of participant faculty use of resource-based-learning, knowledge of information literacy, use of information literacy and use of integrated assessments.*

Criteria: *75% of participating faculty will indicate an increased understanding of information literacy; 35% of faculty will indicate resource-based-learning improves student classroom experience, enhances learning and adds creativity to their teaching.*

NOTE:

- Resource-based learning is defined as a "method of teaching and learning that requires the student to explore a topic by finding information in numerous and varied sources of information." (ACRL)
- Information literacy is defined as "the set of skills needed to find, retrieve, analyze, and use information effectively." (ACRL)
- Assessment is defined as "the act or process of gathering data to better understand the strengths or weaknesses of student learning." (ACRL)

Methodology and Results

Participating faculty members answered a short survey (see Appendix L) measuring their use of resource-based learning, their familiarity with and incorporation of information literacy into pedagogical strategies, and their integration of assessment as part of those strategies. Information was also gathered on respondents' methods for introducing students to the concept of information literacy, including levels of collaboration with librarians and library resources. A free response section prompted respondents to comment on their experience collaborating with librarians and how that collaboration influenced their understanding of information literacy and the quality of student work.

Overall, results were positive:

- 96.87% of respondents indicated that they incorporate resource-based learning as a pedagogical strategy (71.09% frequently; 25.78% sometimes)
- 100% of respondents claimed familiarity with the concept of information literacy (84.92% very; 15.08% somewhat)
- 90.55% of respondents indicated that student papers and/or projects demonstrated improvement with library instruction in information literacy concepts (66.14% definitely; 24.41% somewhat).

Participants revealed through their narrative comments that the greatest area of value was an increased knowledge about and incorporation of information literacy into their pedagogy. This increase in understanding and implementation was a direct result of both ongoing collaboration with librarians and participation in IL workshops made possible through the LSTA grant.

Analysis

Faculty members from 18 of the 28 colleges originally participating in the LSTA grant responded to the faculty survey, for a total of 130 respondents. Seven (7) of the 18 responding colleges each had 9-19 faculty members complete the survey; the remaining 11 had 1-7 faculty members complete the survey. Faculty were asked to answer 11 multiple

choice questions, 2 optional questions in which they could elaborate on information provided in two of the multiple choice questions, and 1 free-response question where they could describe their experience collaborating with librarians and how that collaboration impacted their understanding of information literacy and the quality of student work. 126-128 respondents answered each of the 11 multiple choice questions. 17 and 19 respondents, respectively, elaborated through the 2 optional questions (Q#6 & Q#13). 97 respondents reflected on their collaboration experience in the free-response question.

Question one established the respondents' school affiliation. Question two established that 96.87% of responding faculty do incorporate resource-based learning as part of their pedagogical strategy (71.09% frequently; 25.78% sometimes). Question three resoundingly illustrated faculty familiarity with the concept of information literacy (84.92% very; 15.08% somewhat). Question four illustrated the degree to which faculty incorporate assessment of student's information literacy into their assignments: 29.69% systematically; 38.28% often; 30.47% sometimes; 1.56% not at all).

Question five outlined the various ways in which faculty members' students are introduced to information literacy concepts: 93.75% through faculty members' own instruction; 82.03% through librarian instruction; 33.59% through research tutorials or handbooks; 11.72% through "other." Some of the "other" methods mentioned by faculty in Question six (optional - 17 respondents) include:

- Literacy Information Worksheet at beginning and end of course
- Demonstration of IL skills through websites & guest speakers
- Guided practice with computers and information resources during class
- Hands on research into questions that come up in class
- Guided critique of information
- Project instructions about sources of information
- Course links to library on-line resources
- Use of librarian developed information literacy rubric
- Guided tour of library website
- Course integrated exercises that require students to develop an understanding of intellectual property rights
- Alternate reality games
- Students have already received IL instruction in other courses

Question seven reported the degree to which faculty members collaborated with librarians to design assignments that assess students' abilities in the research process: 29.69% often; 53.91% sometimes; 16.41% not at all. In Question eight faculty members stated that student papers and/or projects demonstrated improvement with library instruction in

information literacy concepts 90.55% of the time (66.14% definitely; 24.41% somewhat).

Question nine established that faculty members incorporated library instruction into pre-college level courses (24.22% of respondents), 100-level courses (81.25% of respondents), and 200-level courses (45.31% of respondents). 3.12% reported no incorporation.

In Question ten 85.16% of faculty members reported that their students learn systematically (35.16%) or often (50.00%) how to evaluate information. 14.06% reported their students learn how to evaluate information only sometimes. Faculty members' students learned to effectively use information resources as a main objective 45.31% of the time, as a secondary objective 51.56% of the time, and as an aside 3.12% of the time (Question 11).

Question twelve showed that faculty members use several methods to assess information literacy concepts in their students' work. 62.70% reported using rubrics. 20.63% reported using pre- and/or post-tests. 78.57% reported using grading criteria. 15.08% reported other methods, some examples of which follow (Question 13, optional - 19 respondents):

- Assignments specifically designed around information literacy
- Classroom discussions
- "Ten Minute Briefs" - mini essays in response to specific questions about how to do research
- Students' ability to get the necessary resources for their work
- Questionnaire or short essay about what they learned during a library tour
- Evaluation checklists on online resources
- Written self-evaluation at end of quarter listing four things they learned or learned from small group activities
- Self assessment surveys on how to do research
- Assignments based specially on finding and critiquing a source of information
- Student conferencing

Salient Points

- "Our library staff is the best in the universe: they are on the spot, up to date, friendly, and tenacious researchers who are always willing to educate."

Listed below are some of the comments most salient to the overall purpose of Outcome #3 (resource-based learning incorporated as a pedagogical strategy; increased faculty understanding of information literacy; faculty recognition that resource-based learning improves student classroom experience, enhances learning and adds creativity to teaching).

To address this, the final survey Question (#14) asked faculty members to comment on their experiences collaborating with librarians and how that experience has impacted their understanding of information literacy and the quality of student work. 97 of the 130 survey respondents addressed this question. All comments offer insight into the faculty experience and may be viewed in full in the appendix attached to this Outcome.

At least 27 respondents commented on how they incorporate resource-based learning into their pedagogical strategy. Comments include:

- "Now that I have seen the light, thanks to the instruction and support of my...librarians, I make IL one of the key learning objectives in my course."
- "As a result of the grant I more systematically incorporate information literacy into my classes."
- "(M)y experiences collaborating with the librarians are positive and essential. They work closely with me every quarter to develop instruction sessions..."
- "Thanks to the many librarians' websites developed to support my students' learning in dozens of courses, to links between their sites and mine, and to ongoing exchanges and collaborations between history and library faculty, we have come to regard our work as team work...."
- "At times when I have an objective for students but don't have an assignment already designed, (the faculty librarians) have been creative and very effective in helping me design a specific assignment to improve information competency skills."

18 respondents observed directly that their understanding of information literacy had grown directly from work with the LSTA grant project and with librarians. Others alluded to this growth indirectly. Some comments include:

- "Our library faculty...are helpful to both students and other faculty and through presentations and materials they have increased awareness of information literacy across campus."
- "I had a (math) assignment that really depended on the students finding good resources. Up until I went to the Info Lit workshop the assignment regularly tanked for half the class. After amending the assignment at the Info Lit workshop it was a total hit."
- "My work with librarians helps me become more familiar with search technologies as well as the search tools available and how to make the best use of them. I also get good ideas from the librarians about how to teach certain information and skills related to information literacy."
- "Through my collaboration with librarians, I have learned methods for introducing concepts, making strong assignments, and assessing students' work."
- "I revised and refined a major information literacy student learning project so that it more effectively addressed the information literacy outcomes adopted by my college. This grant work benefits me, my students, and the assessment work of my department."

At least 32 respondents recognized explicitly that resource-based learning improves student classroom experience, enhances learning and adds creativity to teaching. Comments include:

- "With the library instruction incorporated in my class, research papers have improved which has also lead to improved grades, increased knowledge for students, and less frustration for me."
- "I am happy to report that there has been an improvement in the quality of research presented in my students' work since the IL Immersion sessions. Thank you."
- "Our librarians (and I)...work toward the outcome of 'valuing inquiry' as our collaborative goal. I assess that with student journals and also an electronic assessment. Students report that they have found the assignment useful in their other classes and many wonder why it is not mandatory for all incoming students to engage in a similar introduction to the library, basic research techniques, and website analysis."
- "(The grant) was a great opportunity for me to really re-think how I approach and use outside resources in several of my classes.... And I know the papers were better because the students had used a better process in exploring topics, finding resources, coordinating their research, and then putting together a paper (as opposed to skipping the first three steps and just writing a paper based on some Internet info they found!)"
- "Several faculty from our program have added workshop sessions on research into our course content for specific projects. Feedback from students has been primarily positive and they are understanding the importance of IL as a marketable work skill for exploring potential employers, preparing for interviews, researching trends and forecasts, and exploring resources for historical and cultural information as it impacts costume and design, etc."

Outcome IV

"Collaboratively design plans for implementing information literacy on each of our 34 campuses in order to be strategic rather than tactical in our development of information literacy programs."

Assessment: Spreadsheet of implementation and plan development.

Criteria: 25 colleges will develop a plan and 15 will implement 15% of the plan by year 4.

Methodology:

The Data Analysis Group developed a multiple choice question survey (see Appendix M) and asked each college to measure what level of implementation they achieved with their IL action plans. Options included 0%, 15%, 25%, 50%, 75% or greater implementation on campus.

Results:

Of the 22 responses we received, all reported at least a 25% implementation of their initial

IL action plans, with sixteen campuses reporting over 50% implementation and six colleges reporting over 75% implementation of their plans. This result exceeds the outcome's criteria.

Analysis:

Review of the Case Studies from Immersion shows that the schools involved face a wide variety of challenges. Some identified geographical issues, including scattered campuses and off-campus learners. Many noted time and personnel issues, having too much to do and too little staff. Nevertheless, certain themes repeated over and over again in the action plans.

Most libraries identified a goal focused on faculty collaboration. Some decided they needed to evaluate what they currently offered, to develop a plan to focus their energies where need was greatest. Many libraries spoke of expanding their repertoire of educational technology, both to teach more innovatively and to enlarge the pool of students the library could reach. Almost all schools noted that they wanted to either develop new ways of assessing student learning, or examine their current methods.

Salient Points:

- "Our reference/instruction librarians are an energetic and creative lot, receptive to change and eager for the next new challenge. As a result, our instruction program falls into the "collection of activities" category – a smorgasbord of experiments and models. Immersion is a gift – an opportunity to come together and hammer out a mission, outcomes and action plans for high priority issues that will provide a framework for future instruction."
- (L)ike many small libraries – our limited time is devoted to "doing" rather than planning what to do. From our Immersion experience, we have concluded that we need to undertake a planning process for our library as a whole, not just for our information literacy program.
- "Visions of where we want to be (include) having many, proven effective, modes of instruction in place to reach learners in many contexts."
- "We will reexamine the assessment tools and rubrics we have developed in light of our new framework in order to connect them with assignments more fluidly."
- "Librarians will implement instruction assessments in order to continually improve instruction."
- "Library faculty will maintain a website listing of exercises, assignments and assessments that are suitable for community college IL instruction."

The Action Plans developed at Immersion were often detailed and ambitious. These high aspirations may have meant that a larger percentage of the plans were not fully implemented. But the fact that these plans were discussed, written down, and acted upon may also mean that more was accomplished that would have otherwise been the

case.

Salient Points:

- "Immersion helped frame planning and collaboration to help us create and articulate a real information plan that we can share with our colleagues outside the library."
- "Reframing a situation or issue helps me understand things from a different perspective. If I can reframe an issue from structural to a human resource or political frame, sometimes I find a better solution that is better suited than initially thought. I have also come to really appreciate the symbolic frame."

Outcome V

Develop data collection and reporting instruments that focus on student learning and retention in threshold courses in order to assist directors in measuring the library's contributions to student achievement.

Assessment: Spreadsheet of instruments; survey of library directors.

Criteria: 75% of library directors will indicate the instruments developed are effective in documenting the instructional and student success and retention dimensions of the library to administrators.

Work on this outcome began in August of 2008 at an all-day retreat of librarians and library directors with facilitators Lisa Hinchliffe and Bonnie Gratch-Lindauer. This group met to begin work on this outcome related to developing data collection and reporting instruments that could help libraries demonstrate a library's impact on student success and retention. The big activity was to examine how a college's mission, goals, strategic directions, values and student learning outcomes intersected with our libraries and information literacy programs. The following were common "elements" in the above categories across most of the community and technical colleges.

- Excellence / Continuous Improvement
- Economic Well-Being, Community Enrichment & Stewardship
- Critical Thinking
- Community of Learners
- Collaboration
- Access
- Technology Leadership
- Student-Centered Environment
- Retention
- Responsibility / Personal Integrity
- Quality Learning / Achieve Career Goals / Progress Between Programs & Institutions
- Outreach & Partnerships
- Multiculturalism; Global Understanding / Civilization; Diversity; Internationalization
- Respect for Others
- Lifelong Learning / Building a Better Future

In groups, Directors and librarians brainstormed the activities, services and programs our libraries offered that supported these elements. See Appendix N for the brainstorming for each of these elements. At a later meeting, Library Directors in small teams re-examined

this brainstorming and asked the following questions.

- What's missing?
- What are the priorities?
- What has the most impact? What's the specific language?
- What are the measurable data elements?

Appendix O demonstrates the brainstorming related to these questions for three of the elements. Unfortunately, much of the second round of brainstorming was lost by the small teams and further progress has not been made. This will be continuing work for the LMCD group.

Grant Deliverables

Deliverables

- 1. Librarians trained to integrate information literacy into courses and assess the effect on student learning.**

See sections for Outcomes 1 and 2.

- 2. Information literacy plans for each participating college.**
- 3. Action Plans for the duration of the grant and sustainability efforts after the grant.**

22 of the participating colleges wrote and implemented their Information Literacy Action plans. Libraries' success with implementation and next steps is discussed in the section for Outcome 4.

- 4. New course-related assignments, a pool of model assignments and best practices.**
- 5. Assessment tools and methodologies.**
- 6. Pedagogy techniques for using inquiry based and resource-based learning in the disciplines.**

Librarians brought course-related assignments to the 2006 workshop "Creating, Collaborating and Implementing Authentic Assessments in Teaching". Those and additional assignments were posted on the IL Grant Wiki at: <http://informationliteracywactc.pbwiki.com/Teaching+Tips> which remains open for additions. Additional Best Practices have already been described in the section for Outcomes 1 and 2. Regular grant workshop also facilitated the regular exchange of ideas and approaches.

- 7. Updated Information Competency position statement from the LMDC. This will include a plan to forward information literacy in the community and**

technical colleges.

Feedback has been gathered on changes needed for LMDC position statement. The draft is still undergoing revision and has been rolled into a collaborative effort with the 4-year public universities to co-author some documents about our shared purposes with information literacy. First, we are attempting to articulate the skills and abilities students should have at the Rising Junior level -- a group of students we all work with. Second, we are working on an "Executive Summary" about information literacy that we could use with various audiences - librarians, discipline faculty and administrators to convey the importance of and components to having strong information literacy initiatives at our institutions.

8. Data collection and reporting methods for defining student learning.

This has been largely addressed in the colleges' assessment projects related to student learning discussed in Outcome 1.

This work was also begun with Outcome 5 related to the August 20th, 2007 workshop of WA CTC Library Directors and librarians.

Dissemination and sharing of project results

1. A project website will be developed to not only keep participants informed about the project, but will allow librarians from outside the system to follow the progress. This website will be linked to the WA State Library web site.

A blog was created at <http://www.pierce.ctc.edu/Library/Istagrant/> and used during the first year to post information and resources related to the grant. But the majority of the grant's work is at the IL Grant wiki at: <http://informationliteracywactc.pbwiki.com> (see Appendix P). The wiki gave the Coordinator a place to post the work of each college and other activities related to the grant. Librarians also had the password to the wiki so that they could post their reports or other materials. The site also shows considerable interest from people outside of our system as there are regularly "visitors" from other states and even countries to our wiki. This was a valuable way to collect, track and share our work.

2. Project update to the Instruction Commission once a year.

Project updates were given regularly to the Library/Media Director's Council and to the State Library with written reports and presentations at meetings. The Coordinator did

not make direct reports to the Instruction Commission.

3. **Presentations at the spring 2007 ACRL meeting.**
4. **Joint presentations of librarians and faculty in disciplines at the Statewide Assessment Conference.**

Below are the presentations made by librarians and faculty engaged in grant activities.

Peninsula College - David Kent

The Olympic Peninsula Association for the Education of Young Children (OPAEOYC) 15th Annual Early Childhood Conference (co-sponsored by the Peninsula College Early Childhood Education Program), "Building for the Future" 2008- "Tactics and Tips to Find Quality ECE Resources"

Seattle Central Community College & South Seattle Community College - Karen Michaelsen and Kelley McHenry (SCCC), Esther Sunde (SSCC)

LOEX 2007, San Diego - "Taking Immersion Home: Developing Ownership of Information Literacy among Faculty"

Spokane Falls Community College - Mary Ann Lund Goodwin & Barbara Oldham

Teaching and Learning Conference 2008, Spokane - "The Embedded Librarian"

University of Washington, Bothell/Cascadia Community College - Leslie Bussert

ACRL 2007 poster session, Baltimore, MD - But Did They Get It?? Collaborating with Faculty to Assess Information Literacy Learning

Companion website: <http://library.uwb.edu/ACRL2007/butdidtheygetit/index.html>

Digital poster: <http://library.uwb.edu/ACRL2007/butdidtheygetit/poster.pdf>

Yakima Valley Community College – Joan Weber

ALA Annual Conference June 2006 – "Model Programs from the Immersion Experience: Successes and Challenges"

5. Journal articles for publication in library and other professional journals

Debbie Crumb recently had a chapter published in the following book.

Crumb, Debbie and Eric Palo. "It's Showtime! : Engaging Students in Library Instruction." Practical Pedagogy for Library Instructors: 17 Innovative Strategies to Improve Student Learning. Ed. Douglas Cook and Ryan Sittler. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2008.

The Data Analysis Group is pursuing publication of these grant findings in a variety of publications (potential publications listed below). Nothing has been published to date.

ACRL WA Newsletter
ALKI - WA Lib Association Journal
C&RL News
Portal

Project Implementation –Lessons Learned

What Worked

Collaboration and Networking

Clearly one of the biggest gains was our ability to work with colleagues at different colleges that were facing similar challenges over a sustained period of time. We were able to share and benefit from knowing the challenges and solutions other colleges were trying from the classroom to the larger college campus environment.

Financial resources for libraries

Many libraries face staffing challenges that made engaging in this work difficult because of increased planning, development and implementation time needed. The grant made it possible for libraries to create more time by being able to use their part-timers for desk coverage so that full-time libraries could work on these projects and/or attend grant workshops. The grant also helped some colleges reduce barriers of participation related to the cost of travel. This support made engaging in deeper information literacy work feasible and sustainable over the course of the grant.

Financial resources for faculty

Grant funds made it possible for libraries to offer discipline faculty funds to support the extra time needed for these beginning collaborations. One of the consistent findings is that assessing information literacy is highly tied to the quality of the collaboration between faculty and librarians. These relationships take time that varies according to the faculty's knowledge of information literacy and the complexity of the assessment project.

IL Grant Wiki

This was a highly successful way to collect and make available to the participants all of the work of the grant.

What Didn't Work (or could have worked better)

IL Committee

The grant was meant to have an IL Committee for various aspects of grant activities. Although this group was formed in the beginning, it was difficult to make this group effective in shaping the work over the course of five years. As a result, the Coordinator often worked in consultation with the three Library Directors that wrote the original

proposal. It might have been possible and desirable to have this structure work better.

Challenges of being in different places

An ongoing difficulty was the geographic distances between colleges and the differing academic calendars. Although one of the benefits of the grant was being able to work with colleagues they might not otherwise easily see, it was often difficult to schedule workshops in locations that were easy for all potential participants to attend. The Coordinator tried to incorporate a good variety of locations to balance out travel for the various colleges. It was also difficult to find dates and times that worked well for all libraries. Our breaks and quarters are not on the same schedule and that sometimes meant scheduling activities when some libraries might be on break. Grant funds were used to subsidize funds need to provide reference coverage or for someone that might be off-contract.

Turnover

Many colleges experienced turnover in their library faculty. But there was also considerable turnover of Library Directors in the years of the grant. Changes in personnel often impacted the momentum of the information literacy program at that library.

ACRL's "Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices"

We decided to use this list of "Characteristics" as a way to benchmark the progress libraries felt they made over the course of the grant. We asked them to consider and indicate if each factor was not at all present, "under discussion", "in planning", a "new or ongoing activity" or "program strength". We tried to indicate that not every characteristic was equally important and some would not even apply at all. Still, we received pretty strong feedback that this list of characteristics really did not fit community and technical colleges. It was a good exercise to try this as a self-assessment tool and get the feedback that it did not resonate for community and technical college libraries.

What did the participants about the grant process say?

FROM PROGRAM TRACK SELF ASSESSMENT

- "Immersion helped frame planning and collaboration to help us create and articulate a real information plan that we can share with our colleagues outside the library."
- "The most useful ideas learned at Immersion centered around techniques to enhance collaboration."

FROM TEACHER TRACK SELF ASSESSMENT

- "Our IL plan included outreach to target groups and the teacher track provided help in

teaching diverse groups. Since Immersion, I have been better able to adapt teaching to our target groups and the students have come to report their successes (i.e. improved information literacy skills)."

FROM BEST PRACTICES REPORT, FINAL QUESTION

Do you feel the grant and its activities have been helpful or supportive in accomplishing your goals? What else could be done?

- Edmonds: "Yes, grant provided much needed financial support to this work. In addition, our commitment to this greater statewide effort made our work a priority and added weight to our IL outreach efforts with faculty and the institution."
- Grays Harbor: "Yes, overall. I have sometimes felt there was too much theory and not enough practicality."
- Highline: "Absolutely. Another round of financial support would be nice. Together with strategic models for how to reach faculty in a systemic way."
- North Seattle: "The grant and its activities have been very helpful in supporting librarians' efforts in integrating information literacy into curriculum. The Immersion seminars, workshops and ongoing conversation are instrumental in raising the level of awareness on campus level. Some faculty members have benefitted from professional development opportunities and librarians' support in creating or revising their assignments."
- Olympic – "Kept us on track, and came at a time when "Core Abilities" was becoming very important at the college."
- "I'd like more IL marketing information."
- Pierce: "Yes! We'd also like to explore having workshops or meetings with librarians at other institutions (locally, regionally or statewide) to continue learning from each other."
- Renton: "The grant has been helpful in increasing the collaboration and sharing of ideas between librarians in developing library workshops including centralizing our workshop documents in one online location. It has also helped increased the collaboration between librarians and program/class instructors."
- Seattle Central: "The grant was instrumental in initiating and sustaining our recent efforts in IL. The ACRL Immersion created the initial momentum while our local immersion helped us share what we learned with our faculty partners. The funds for mini-grants helped keep faculty engaged in formal projects focusing on IL. The grant dovetailed well with our concurrent marketing grant resulting in a college filled with "IL Champions" who can articulate what IL is, why it is important, and how to assess it."
- Skagit : "Yes, I commend Lynn Olson for keeping us on track. It was especially helpful to learn what other schools were doing and taking some of their ideas and incorporating them here. The immersion program really helped us focus and kick off our program."
- South Seattle: "Definitely, in giving us tools, awareness and funding support to create new programs to work with faculty."
- Tacoma: "Yes, helpful to have an outside "taskmaster" and an ethical obligation to perform work for the funds we received (helped to offset the challenges listed above). Helpful to meet with others engaged in the same work."
- Whatcom: "The grant has been very helpful in directing the library to the tools we need to plan our information literacy program and to assess our effectiveness campus-wide and in the classroom."
- "I think the grant provided a great beginning. The faculty who attended is no longer working here - so that knowledge base was lost to us. The other librarians have not taken up the efforts to the extent I would have liked. We still have a ways to go - but will keep working to do more with IL on our campus."

Conclusion

This was a unique effort for a state-wide library group (Community and Technical Colleges) to pursue advanced professional development in information literacy programming, teaching and assessment. With LSTA support, over 20 college libraries were afforded the time and financial means to plan, develop and implement information literacy programs that were largely non-existent at the grant's inception.

This work directly touched of minimum of 157 discipline faculty, over 100 librarians and most importantly, 5668 students. We are beginning to see the impact that our teaching has on student success and the ways we can highlight the unique and important contributions we make to student learning. We are able to confirm the importance of our collaborative relationships with discipline faculty. These relationships allow us to strengthen the presence of resource-based learning in the curriculum and our ability to assess students' increasing information literacy skills. Our goal is information literate 21st century lifelong learners!